

General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
June 18, 2001
Revised July 9, 2001

Interest Group:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Alexandra Elias	American Planning Association
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Eric Bruvold	SD Regional Economic Development Corporation
Gary Piro	Save Our Land Value
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Federation
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Michael Johnson	American Institute of Architects
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects

Public at Large:

A. Wolfsheimer Stutz	
Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Carl Meyer	SDFFF
Charlene Ayers	
Chris Anderson	Ramona Chamber of Commerce
D. Pallinger	MVR
David Shibley	
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Gary Wynn	NCCELS
Janet Anderson	Sierra Club
Jeanne Pagett	
Jerry McLees	Sweetwater Authority
Joe Klasen	Potrero
Laura Houle	ESDCAR
Liz Higgins	San Diego Association of Realtors
Mary Anne Pentis	Vernal Pool Society
Michael Thometz	Merit
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Pat Flanagan	SDNHM
Paul Gebert	San Diego County Water Authority
Peggy Gentry	WRT (Consultant)
Rich Cantillon	Sierra Club
Ruth Potter	LWVSDCO
Sally Westbrook	Ramona C of C
Wanda Kwiatt	

County:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary L. Pryor (DPLU)

Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Aaron Barling (DPLU)
Dixie Switzer (DPLU)

The meeting commenced at 12:17 pm.

Agenda Item II: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for June 4, 2001
 - The spelling of Scott Molloy's name was corrected.
 - E. Bruvold proposed that the minutes eliminate the details concerning the Board of Supervisor's motion and only indicate that an update on the hearing was presented.
- b) Board of Supervisors Minute Order for May 23, 2001
 - Board has not yet approved the Order.
- c) Project Schedule & Next Steps
 - Next meeting will be July 9th.
- d) Notice of Transportation Workshop
 - Transportation workshop will be held at DPLU on June 23.
 - Rick Pruitt will give a presentation to the Interest Group and Steering Committee on July 14 and at the Interest Group meeting on July 16th.
 - D. Silver expressed concern as to how the group's concepts would be used by the consultants. I. Holler said that map preparation would be on hold until the group completed the concepts. The maps would also reflect constraints. J. Whalen requested a restatement of the group's vision: no losers, back-country stays as it is, infrastructure based, incentives, and equity. P. Pryde responded that the "no down-zoning" stance conflicts with the premise of TDRs. D. Silver suggested that the group gain concurrence on the outcome and then determine how to get there.

Agenda Item III: Open Space Resource Area Criteria Discussion/Action –

- K. Scarborough pointed out that the open space resource issue was still unresolved.
- E. Bowlby asked whether, in the context of the minute order, the consultant was waiting for the group to decide the feasibility of using the existing general plan before beginning the maps. I. Holler stated that the feasibility of using the existing general plan was reviewed during the testing of Alternative 1. G. Piro felt that the group needed further consideration of the concepts, transportation, preservation, and densities and that July 9 was too soon for maps. He also stated that he had talked to Supervisor Horn's office regarding the directive of the Board to use the existing plan. K. Scarborough asked to table the discussion until agenda item 5 was introduced. E. Bruvold commented that the criteria was only a third, that design guidelines and tools such as TDRs must also be considered before the maps can be drawn. D. Silver responded that experts can help the group get to where it's going but they've agreed on an equity mechanism. The group needs a distribution outcome to model the TDR system. K. Scarborough thought the three items requiring resolution would have been criteria, transportation, and biological gap analysis. G. Piro stated that Alternative 3 maps were done in a vacuum and was concerned about where geographic transit centers would be located and about the TDR issue. I. Holler and K. Scarborough affirmed that the Steering Committee would be formally involved in the transportation workshop and the tools workshop and that the maps were on hold. D. Coombs thought a field trip would help and agreed to meet with K. Scarborough after the meeting to discuss it. K. Scarborough suggested moving on to discuss the open space resource area and the Farm Bureau's proposal. E. Bowlby felt the Alternative 3 process had produced valuable

information regarding groundwater, the circulation element, and environmentally sensitive areas and that the information should not be lost.

- A. Stehly reviewed the Farm Bureau's proposal to allow 10 acre farms inside the CWA and 40 acres outside the CWA with the provision to allow 10 acres if findings were made, based on stringent requirements, that enough water and the right soil were available, and to delete "open space" from the name. He felt that "open" implied public land where people can trespass. K. Messer expressed concern about how to define a farm and the link between the farm economy and housing. D. Silver asked if the proposal was really necessary and whether there is already enough parcelized land to meet future need of farmers. The first task is to keep farmland in production. Has the County run out of potential land to create new farmland and is there capacity in semi-rural to support new ag use. The Farm Bureau's proposal creates "by right" spot zoning. If crops fail, the landowner has the right to build. Ag easements can be used to prevent this but is the proposal necessary? E. Bowlby said the County needs designated ag areas. P. Pryde suggested open space name be changed to Natural Resource Conservation Area. J. Whalen asked whether all soil types and water availability had been mapped. A. Stehly replied that soil is mapped but the only way to determine water availability is to dig wells. P. Pryde added that only 5% of farms are on prime soil and farming is not soil dependent.

❖ **Clarification made at the July 9, 2001 Interest Group Committee meeting: P.**
Pryde's statement should have been stated as "...only 5% of farms are on prime soil and farming is not prime-soil dependent."

J. Whalen commented that buying an easement could work but housing may still be needed for farmer and farmhands. T. Barker suggested having development criteria and design guidelines. She also preferred Open Space Resource Area. K. Messer felt ag was trying to get special treatment and she didn't see the necessity.

❖ **Comment made at the July 9, 2001 Interest Group Committee meeting: E.**
Bowlby stated that he did not feel that the Farm Bureau was requesting special treatment but rather that they were asking for an exemption from the Endangered Species Act.

D. Silver said one can't distinguish between farm compounds and housing. Farms must stay in production. The County needs certainty – a TDR program, perhaps subsidized water, but not spot zoning. A. Stehly responded that he didn't know if it was necessary to expand ag or if there was enough room in semi-rural to create new farms, but designation of ag zones presupposes what crops will be grown in the future and what climate those crops might need. If farmers don't get TDRs, they will lose equity. They don't want special treatment but they've given up huge amounts of ground. Make the process to get the 10 acre exemption a protracted one. E. Bruvold expressed concern that spot zoning will produce residential creep and suggested that a subcommittee research the issues. A. Stehly indicated there are more farms now than 20 years ago, also more acreage and revenue but average size is decreasing. D. Silver suggested that maps be prepared before final resolution of this issue so group will know where semi-rural areas are located and where potential farmland exists. A. Elias recommended designating ag as a priority and leaving the details until later. K. Doyle supported formation of a subcommittee. E. Bowlby opposed.

- **Motion:** A. Stehly moved to adopt the Farm Bureau proposal. Second by G. Piro. T. Barker stated she could not support the motion because 1 to 40 changes to 1 to 10. K. Messer amended the motion – Add to the guiding principles, #9 Preserve agriculture and provide appropriate support for new agriculture. And form a subcommittee to address these. Second by J. Whalen. In light of K Messer's new motion, A. Stehly withdrew his original motion. K. Messer asked A. Stehly if other members of the Farm Bureau would like to serve on the subcommittee but A. Stehly said it wasn't necessary.
- **Public Comment:**
 - ⇒ D. Shibley was concerned about farms under 10 acres.
 - ⇒ D. Van Dierendonck felt the subcommittee should include someone to represent equine interests.
 - ⇒ Wanda stated that we can't decide where farming can succeed based on maps because we have too much diversity.

- ⇒ Unidentified gentleman asked what guarantee there would be that existing farms less than 10 acres would be allowed to continue farming. P. Pryde assured him that the proposal didn't affect existing parcels.
- ⇒ Unidentified lady from Borrego Springs didn't want 10 acre lots east of CWA because they require schools, roads, and ground water.
- ⇒ C. Meyers pointed out that in 1996 the County changed to [Ag (20) designated areas] 40 acres east of the CWA and zoning permits buildings.
- ⇒ R. Potter commented that federal forest and state parks also need water and that small ag parcels use lots of water.
- K. Messer stated that the issue did not affect existing ag – only new. Semi-rural covered residential uses and small farms. Was this category sufficient to address the issue? E. Bowlby asked if there is a right to farm and A. Stehly replied that it only protects existing farms. K. Scarborough called for a vote on the motion.
- **Action:** motion passed unanimously

Agenda Item IV: MSCP and RPO Discussion –

- Tom Oberbauer (Environmental Resource Manager, MSCP) provided information concerning the group's biological GAP analysis questions. His department will be combining map data layers and can do an overlay of the planning group areas. They won't be meeting with biological experts because they just concluded a similar meeting for the North County MSCP. Sensitive species data base is used to create distribution maps for each species. Then they create density maps. The matrix model allows them to deal with many species simultaneously. Their analysis includes any species that may be potentially sensitive in San Diego County.
- LeAnn Carmichael presented an overview of the Resource Protection Ordinance and environmental constraints. The Board directed DPLU to revise the RPO. It will be similar to the Biological Mitigation Ordinance and will be tied to GP2020 standards regarding steep slopes, floodways, floodplains, and wetlands as well as biological standards. B. Gendron requested a copy of the Biological Standards Guideline under CEQA.

Return to Agenda Item III: Open Space Resource Areas Criteria –

- K. Scarborough verified that, as a result of the previous vote, the holds that had been placed on the Open Space Resource Areas and on ag in the concepts were now taken off. G. Piro said that if the purpose of the motion had been to take the hold off density, he would have to withdraw his vote. He asked if the motion already voted on was to take ag holds off the 3 concepts. K. Scarborough stated that the holds on Concept D still existed but holds on open space for the other concepts were to be removed. G. Piro thought the motion was to change the guiding principles. He didn't feel they could discuss density until transportation was addressed. K. Scarborough thought the density discussion applied to Concept D. G. Piro stated that any reference to density in all concepts was subject to a hold. K. Scarborough thought the holds were placed because of agriculture, not density. M. Adams stated that 1du/160ac needed more discussion but they needed closure on concepts before giving them to Ivan for maps. D. Silver thought the group had included densities. He thought the Farm Bureau needed a hold for ag purposes. L. Carmichael suggested that even if open space resource areas needed discussion on density, other issues could still be mapped. Open space densities are low and don't significantly impact the density in other areas or the overall population. K. Scarborough asked if they should take the hold off the paragraph and leave it on the densities in all concepts. D. Silver felt they should move forward on the map process to better understand the economic value lost or gained which would be necessary for the TDR implementation. I. Holler said it was possible for staff to begin working on the maps but not complete them until after the transportation meeting. G. Piro thought the mapping should wait until after transportation and TDR information.
- **Motion:** K. Messer made a motion to move the holds in the concepts from the open space category to the 4 individual bullets under the open space category. Second by G. Piro. Unanimously passed.

- **Motion:** D. Silver made a motion to move forward with partial mapping without foreclosing future options and allow the engines to start. Second by D. Coombs. M. Adams amended motion to include concurrent analysis on the feasibility of using the existing general plan as directed by the Board. D. Coombs responded that existing plan was already considered in the Alternative 3 process and it is out of date. K. Messer felt directive should be considered as ground floor for equity mechanisms and that the group needed technical assistance and broad brushed maps. K. Scarborough asked for volunteers for an ag subcommittee which now consists of D. Silver, K. Messer, M. Adams, D. Van Dierendonck, E. Bowlby, P. Pryde, and A. Stehly. L. Carmichael then restated D. Silvers' motion to begin the mapping process. K. Scarborough included the amendment by M. Adams to also include the feasibility of using existing general plan and added K. Messer's amendment to do the feasibility study in conjunction with equity mechanisms. E. Bowlby stated that equity was perceived value and not a right. K. Scarborough restated the motion as starting the engine to begin mapping toward the group's vision, to start with the general plan and use tool box to get the group to their vision. P. Pryde said the motion had become too complicated to vote on.
- **Action:** No vote taken

❖ **Statement made at the July 9, 2001 Interest Group Committee meeting:** E. Bowlby stated that he had requested that the Attorney's definition of development rights and where rights occur on property be included in the minutes. Staff was unable to obtain this information from County Counsel at the time draft minutes were distributed. County Counsel stated that "rights vest when you pull a building permit and spend substantial money and reliance upon it."

Agenda Item VI: Public Comments –

- D. Van Dierendonck commented that a portion of Ramona was left out of the MSCP.
- D. Coombs asked about the status of Ramona's moratorium request. I. Holler said staff's recommendation was to let the normal process continue based on concerns that if the moratorium expired before the new general plan took effect, additional problems could be created.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 pm.